

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/278,601

Applicant(s)
Knipe et al

Examiner
Mosher

Art Unit
1648



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mosher

(3) Zachariades, Nick

(2) Geroqe Neunan

(4) _____

Date of Interview 7/31/02

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 12-22, 31, 36, and 41

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed resuming prosecution of claims 12-22, 31, 36, 41 remaining after interference judgement. GN inherited case after conclusion of interference. GN thinks that the judgment reflects errors, that some claims were indicated as not patentable to Knipe based on prior art, not on interference priority, and inquired if the prior art issues could be taken up in this case or its child. MM indicated no authority to act contrary to the judgement, and would have to consult others. Regarding claims 12-22, GN said interference prosecution raised some issues of unpatentability, but Bd said examiner should decide- however application file shows no record of this exchange. MM recommended GN consider submitting whatever it is to the examiner, so the issue could not be raised in a validity challenge if the claims issued in a patent. GN will ask client if it wants to pursue claims 31, 36, and 41 in the face of a second interference (which Bd apparently indicated was possible, again there is no record of Bd's position in this application record). Will discuss again after

consultation with client
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required